



Delegated Authority and Urgency Decisions

Date: MONDAY MONDAY, 20 APRIL 2020

Enquiries: Antoinette Duhaney, Committee & Member Services Officer, Email: antoinette.duhaney@cityoflondon.gov.uk, Tel: 020 7332 1408

**Delegated or Urgent Decisions taken in accordance with the Court of
Common Council's Standing Orders**

**John Barradell
Town Clerk**

AGENDA

1. COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN

For Information
(Pages 1 - 4)

**2. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE- PROJECTS SUB-COMMITTEE-
REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

For Information
(Pages 5 - 32)

3. CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD - REPORT ON ACTION TAKEN

For Information
(Pages 33 - 34)

Committee: Policy & Resources Court of Common Council	Date: Delegated Authority Urgency
Subject: Financial Services Skills Commission	Non-Public
Report of: Damian Nussbaum, Director of Innovation and Growth	For Decision
Report Author: Claire Tunley, Head of Skills Policy, innovation & Growth	

Public Summary

REPORT NOT FOR PUBLICATION

By virtue of paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person or body (including the authority holding that information)) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

Specifically, paragraph 4 of the report contains sensitive information which may be exempted under the Act, and as this cannot be presented to Members as a separate appendix this report needs to be considered in closed session. It is considered that information falling under the following paragraphs outweighs the public interest in disclosing information.

Summary

Recommendations have been agreed in respect of the establishment of the Financial Services Skills Commission

Contact:

Claire Tunley
Head of Skills Policy
Innovation and Growth
T: 0207 332 3077

Background Documents

Report to Policy & Resources Committee, 19 November 2019

Appendices

Appendix A - Current Membership of the Financial Services Skills Commission
Shadow Board

Appendix B - Contents of Companies House Form IN01

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Freedom Applications Committee

Report of Urgent Action Taken: Award of the Freedom of the City of London by Special Nomination to Thomas Moore

To be presented on Thursday, 23rd April 2020

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

SUMMARY OF ACTION TAKEN

1. In recognition of his initiative to raise money for the NHS during the COVID-19 coronavirus crisis, the Lord Mayor nominated Thomas Moore, also known as Captain Tom Moore, for Freedom of the City of London by Special Nomination. The nomination was seconded by the Chair of Policy and Resources, Deputy Catherine McGuinness. Your Freedom Applications Committee has considered this nomination and is highly supportive of the award.
2. The Freedom will be the first to be given virtually by the Chamberlain with the help of the Clerk of the Chamberlain's Court. The request for approval was submitted under urgency to provide this recognition in time with the completion of the 100 laps of his garden and his 100th birthday, where we hope the Freedom of the City will form one of many honours that are bestowed upon Captain Moore and find our Freedom joined by other Cities across the UK.
3. In consultation with our Communications team they are able to manage this process subject to the Chamberlain's Court being able to provide a virtual solution.

Action Taken

4. Approval was, therefore, granted by the Court of Common Council under urgency procedures to admit Thomas Moore, also known as Captain Tom Moore, to the Freedom of the City of London by Special Nomination; being nominated by The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor, and Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Citizen and Solicitor.

RECOMMENDATION

10. We **recommend** that the action taken be noted.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 17th day of April 2020.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Alderman Sir David Wootton
Chairman, Freedom Applications Committee

Committee:	Date:
Projects Sub Committee – 22.04.20	
Subject: Report of Action Taken Under Delegated Authority or Urgency Powers	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report Author: Antoinette Duhaney	

Summary

This report advises Members of action taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Projects Sub Committee Chairman and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and/ 41(b) since the last meeting.

Recommendation

That Members note the actions taken since the last meeting of the Sub Committee.

Main Report

1. Since the last meeting of the Sub Committee, approval was given to several matters under urgency procedures or delegated authority arrangements, pursuant to Standing Order No. 41, as set out in the paragraphs below.
2. **Guildhall Cooling Plan Replacement** (attached)

Members considered a report proposing a long term solution to meet the cooling needs of the Guildhall Complex in the most cost-effective and environmentally beneficial way.

Action:

1. That budget of **£141,000** (excluding risk) is approved to reach the next Gateway and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis;
2. Note total estimate cost range of **£3.924m** (excluding risk) to £4.324m (including £400k of costed risk post-mitigation) based on the most expensive option, and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis;
3. That a Costed Risk Provision of **£33,200** is approved to reach the next gateway (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain) and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis

3. **Guildhall Steam Plant Replacement** (attached)

Members considered a report proposing a long term solution to meet the humidification needs of the Guildhall Complex in the most cost-effective and environmentally beneficial way

Action

1. That budget of **£85,000** (excluding risk) is approved to reach the next Gateway and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis;
2. Note total estimate cost range of **£1.012m** (excluding risk) to £1.20m (including £189k of costed risk post-mitigation) will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis;
3. That a Costed Risk Provision of **£22,000** is approved to reach the next gateway (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain) and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis.

4. **York Way Estate, London N7, Communal Heating Replacement** (attached)

Members considered a report proposing to renew the current communal heating system serving three blocks at York Way Estate.

Action

1. That the contents of this report are noted;
2. That an additional budget of £40,000 is approved from the Housing Revenue Account for connecting eight flats to the new communal heating system at the York Way Estate.
3. That a further budget of £22,500 is approved from the Housing Revenue Account for temporary heating to be provided at the eight flats due to the existing gas supply being disconnected:
4. That approval is given for TSG to undertake the works outlined at 2 and 3 above;
5. Note the revised project budget of £3,150,490 (excluding risk);
6. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £3,150,490 (excluding risk).
That Option 1, to supply temporary electric boilers and then connect the new communal heating system to the eight previously converted flats at Kinefold House, is approved.

5. 20 Farringdon/ Old Fleet Lane (attached)

Members considered a report summarising the highway improvements implemented under the section 278 works, alongside those undertaken by Transport for London (TfL) on their adjacent road network

Action

1. Note the content of this outcome report;
2. Authorise the Chamberlain's department to return unspent section 278 funds to the Developer as set out in the respective legal agreement subject to the verification of the final account; and
3. Agree to close the 20 Farringdon/ Old Fleet Lane project.

Contact:

Antoinette Duhaney

antoinette.duhaney@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Committees: Corporate Projects Board - for decision under Urgency prior to meeting Projects Sub - for decision Corporate Asset Sub-Committee – for decision	Dates: Urgency for CPB 22 April 2020 01 April 2020
Subject: Guildhall Cooling Plant Replacement Unique Project Identifier: 12214	Gateway 2: Project Proposal Complex
Report of: City Surveyor Report Author: Mark Donaldson	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

Recommendations

1. Next steps and requested decisions	Project Description: Provide a long term solution to meet the cooling needs of the Guildhall Complex in the most cost-effective and environmentally beneficial way.			
	Next Gateway: Gateway 3 - Outline Options Appraisal (Complex)			
	Next Steps:			
	Commission project manager, engineers, and cost consultants to undertake site surveys, identify options and appraise based on whole-life-costs, and produce supporting concept designs in order to recommend a short list of viable options for further detailed appraisal at Gateway 4.			
	Requested Decisions:			
	<div>1. That budget of £141,000 (excluding risk) is approved to reach the next Gateway and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis;</div> <div>2. Note total estimate cost range of £3.924m (excluding risk) to £4.324m (including £400k of costed risk post-mitigation) based on the most expensive option, and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis;</div> <div>3. That a Costed Risk Provision of £33,200 is approved to reach the next gateway (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain) and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis</div>			
2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
	Project Manager	Specialist consultant engineer to manage Outline Appraisal	See below.	£25,000
	Quantity Surveyor	Outline cost plans and whole-life-cost analysis	See below.	£20,000

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

	Mechanical & Electrical design	Options development and technical feasibility	See below.	£40,000
	Structural Engineer	Plant/solution impact on building structure	See below.	£10,000
	Surveys	Condition, asbestos, etc.	See below.	£40,000
	Staff costs	Client-side project management	See below.	£6,000
	Total		See below.	£141,000
<p>The above £141,000 total will be funded as detailed in box 1 above. Appointments for these consultants will be made in consultation with City procurement and in line with the City of London's procurement code.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £33,200</p> <p>This is to cover the risk of the additional surveys being required and management of any asbestos found to enable the survey work. This is to be funded as detailed in box 1 above.</p>				
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Asset Sub-Committee. • Senior Responsible Officer: Dorian Price • The project will be managed by the City Surveyor's Major Projects Team. • A Project Manager will be allocated following GW2 approval and lead on subsequent Gateways and manage the project if approved. 			

Project Summary

4. Context	<p>4.1 The chillers which serve the West Wing and East Wing are at the end of their economical life and risk of failure is increasing.</p> <p>4.2 Some replacement parts are no longer available from the manufacturer.</p> <p>4.3 New regulations coming into force from January 2022 will restrict the availability of the refrigerants used by the all main chillers for the Guildhall Complex.</p> <p>4.4 The existing system is unable to meet cooling demands during very warm weather due to system design limitations.</p> <p>4.5 Maintenance cost of the cooling towers serving the chillers is currently £50k per year. Remedial chiller plant maintenance for 2019 cost £20k.</p>
5. Brief description of project	<p>5.1 Replace the West Wing chillers and consider options to consolidate chiller plant across the Guildhall site to provide a resilient, more efficient long-term solution. The scope also includes consideration of heat rejection system (i.e. cooling towers) and integration to existing chilled water distribution systems.</p>
6. Consequences if project not approved	<p>6.1 Increasing risk of poor performance, failure and extended down-time of chiller plant resulting in inability to maintain environmental control in the Art Gallery (and stores), Amphitheatre, and significant risk of exceeding comfortable conditions within offices (East and West Wings) and public spaces (Business Library, City Centre).</p> <p>6.2 Continued high maintenance cost and risk of cost increases and down-time due to increased component failures from aging plant.</p> <p>6.3 After January 2022 the chillers will be reliant on recycled refrigerant which will increase operational costs and could affect performance.</p> <p>6.4 Increased energy consumption, costs and carbon emissions.</p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

7. SMART project objectives	<p>7.1 The West Wing chillers are replaced by Feb-22 if possible.</p> <p>7.2 The project is delivered within budget.</p> <p>7.3 Options for a consolidated site-wide cooling solution are appraised.</p> <p>7.4 Reliable cooling performance that meets needs for supplied services.</p> <p>7.5 Throughout the project works, maintain environmental conditions within site areas in accordance to their needs.</p> <p>7.6 Minimise disruption from project works to site occupants and the public.</p> <p>7.7 Significant energy savings compared to the existing system.</p> <p>7.8 Minimise the carbon emissions and overall global warming impact.</p> <p>7.9 Lower annual maintenance requirements and associated costs.</p> <p>7.10 Improved resilience of cooling supplied services.</p> <p>7.11 Compliance with energy and refrigerant regulation requirements.</p> <p>7.12 Flexibility to allow for meeting future increased cooling needs.</p>
8. Key benefits	<p>8.1 Cooling supply which satisfies long-term site needs.</p> <p>8.2 Compliance with existing and foreseeable regulations.</p> <p>8.3 Lower whole-life chiller plant costs.</p> <p>8.4 Best practice environmental solution which significantly contribute towards City of London Corporation energy and carbon targets.</p>
9. Project category	7b. Major renewals, typically of a one-off nature (supplementary revenue)
10. Project priority	A. Essential
11. Notable exclusions	None.

Options Appraisal

12. Overview of options	<p>12.1 GW3 shall appraise and recommend the scope for chiller replacement and the main technical chiller solution. This shall build on the studies already undertaken, see Appendix 3.4 and 3.5.</p> <p>12.2 Following GW3, GW4 shall appraise in more detailed the technical solutions for the selected scope to recommend a solution which best meets project objectives.</p> <p>12.3 Options will also consider implications from future site changes, including potential for cooling system distribution refurbishments.</p>
--------------------------------	--

Project Planning

13. Delivery period and key dates	<p>Overall project: minimum and maximum completion dates are: GW2 May-20, GW3 between Jul-20 to Jan-21; GW4 between Dec-20 to Jul-21, GW4c between Mar-21 to Feb-22, GW5 between Aug-21 and Jul-22, Completion between Feb-22 to Mar-23, GW6 between Aug-22 and Oct-23.</p> <p>Key dates: See Appendix 3 for additional details.</p> <p>Other works dates to coordinate: None.</p>
14. Risk implications	Overall project risk: Medium

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

	<p>The project costed risk post-mitigation is £400,000.</p> <p>A Costed Risk Provision of £33,200 is requested to cover the management of any asbestos found to enable the survey work and the risk of the additional surveys being required.</p> <p>After mitigation actions it is anticipated the remaining major risks will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial or complete failure of existing chiller plant prior to installation of replacement chiller plant. • Tender return costs higher than requested project budget. • Disruption to existing live services (e.g. Fire & Security) as a result of change-over. • Brexit impact - Labour shortage and / or materials shortage or delays with deliveries due to the impact of Brexit • External security threat, including terrorist activity. <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2)</p>
15. Stakeholders and consultees	Chamberlains, Corporate Property, Town Clerks, departments occupying or using the Guildhall.

Resource Implications

16. Total estimated cost	Likely cost range (excluding risk): £1.114m - £3.924m The lower cost range is based on the option ('minimal in appendix 3.5 table 2) for replacing only the essential West Wing chillers with like-for-like (i.e. a reduced scope project) and the higher cost range is based on the option (3a in appendix 3.5 table 2) for consolidating chiller plant across the site (i.e. a broader scope project). The cost range has been updated from the Project Briefing to allow consideration of options beyond the replacement of the West Wing Chillers. Likely cost range (including risk): £1.514m - £4.324m		
17. Funding strategy	Choose 1:	Choose 1:	
	Partial funding confirmed	Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource	
	Funds/Sources of Funding		Cost (£)
	Central Funding: additional funding is requested (approved in principle)		£3m
	Total		£3m
Resource Allocation Sub Committee meeting in December 2019 decided to allocate £3m in principle and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis. The release of funds is subject to approval by Resource Allocation Committee.			
If the cost (including risk) for the recommended option is anticipated to exceed the total identified funding, then either additional funding may be requested, or a fall-back option shall be recommended where the project scope is limited to essential plant replacement (West Wing chillers) only.			

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

18. Investment appraisal	Whole-life-cost assessment will be undertaken. This will assess all the main capital and revenue costs over the anticipated life of the replaced assets.
19. Procurement strategy/route to market	The consultant appointments will be made in line with the City's procurement code and prior to the procurement of the Works. When we have further sight of the requirement for the Work, a Procurement Options Report will be provided at the next Gateway.
20. Legal implications	20.1 None.
21. Corporate property implications	21.1 Consolidated site chiller options would consider early replacement of other site chiller plant. 21.2 Chiller plant locations will need to be considered against site plans.
22. Traffic implications	22.1 Plant installation is likely to require a partial short-term road closure of either Basinghall Street and/or Aldermanbury.
23. Sustainability and energy implications	23.1 Highest efficiency chillers, beyond compliance, should be considered. 23.2 Whole-system efficiency improvements should be considered. 23.3 Consolidating site-wide chiller plant could provide higher efficiencies.
24. IS implications	24.1 None.
25. Equality Impact Assessment	An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken.
26. Data Protection Impact Assessment	The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Briefing
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	Additional Project Details

Contact

Report Author	Mark Donaldson
Email Address	mark.donaldson@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1825

This page is intentionally left blank

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Committees: Corporate Projects Board - for decision under Urgency prior to meeting Projects Sub-Committee - for decision Corporate Asset Sub-Committee – for decision	Dates: Urgency for CPB 22 April 2020 01 April 2020
Subject: Guildhall Steam Plant Replacement Previously titled “Guildhall - North Wing - Heat Source - Boilers (Steam) Replacement” Unique Project Identifier: 12213	Gateway 2: Project Proposal Complex
Report of: City Surveyor Report Author: Mark Donaldson	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

Recommendations

1. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Project Description: Provide a long term solution to meet the humidification needs of the Guildhall Complex in the most cost-effective and environmentally beneficial way.</p> <p>Next Gateway: Gateway 3 - Outline Options Appraisal (Complex)</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Commission consultant building service engineers to undertake an outline options appraisal and supporting site/plant surveys and studies. This will inform the recommendation for the project scope (i.e. which areas to provide humidification to) and technical solution(s) (i.e. humidification technology). This will also further develop the project budget and costed risk register.</p> <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That budget of £85,000 (excluding risk) is approved to reach the next Gateway and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis; 2. Note total estimate cost range of £1.012m (excluding risk) to £1.20m (including £189k of costed risk post-mitigation) will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis; 3. That a Costed Risk Provision of £22,000 is approved to reach the next gateway (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer in consultation with the Chamberlain) and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis.
--	--

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
	Project Manager	Specialist consultant engineer to manage Outline Appraisal	See below.	£12,000
	Quantity Surveyor	Outline cost plans and whole-life-cost analysis	See below.	£10,000
	Mechanical & Electrical design	Options development and technical feasibility	See below.	£30,000
	Structural Engineer	Plant/solution impact on building structure	See below.	£5,000
	Surveys	Condition, asbestos, etc.	See below.	£25,000
	Staff costs	Client-side project management	See below.	£3,000
	Total		See below.	£85,000
<p>The above £85,000 total will be funded as detailed in box 1 above. Appointments for these consultants will be made in consultation with City procurement and in line with the City of London's procurement code.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £22,000 to be funded as detailed in box 1 above. This is to cover the risk of the additional technical surveys being identified and management of any asbestos found to enable survey work.</p>				
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Asset Sub-Committee. • Senior Responsible Officer: Dorian Price • The project will be managed by the City Surveyor's Major Projects Team from whom a Project Manager will lead subsequent Gateways. 			

Project Summary

4. Context	<p>4.1 The Guildhall Complex steam generators are approaching the end of their economic life and maintenance issues and the risk of failure is increasing.</p> <p>4.2 The steam generators provide humidification to ventilation systems throughout the Guildhall Complex.</p> <p>4.3 Humidification is essential for maintaining environmental conditions within best practice guidelines and insurance requirements for preservation of artefacts and fabric in publicly accessible or storage locations within the Art Gallery, Amphitheatre, and other areas.</p> <p>4.4 Humidification is also provided for non-essential areas (e.g. offices) to maintain comfort conditions when necessary.</p>
5. Brief description of project	<p>5.1 The project will review the different humidification needs across the site, whether humidification is still needed and to what degree.</p> <p>5.2 Replacement of the end-of-life steam generator plant with a solution which meets the long-term humidification needs of the site.</p> <p>5.3 The project will consider options for the entire system, not just the generation plant, to determine the best whole-system solution and</p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

	options for replacement in part or whole. 5.4 Appraise the technology and system options to arrive at the optimum for whole-life-costs and other objectives.
6. Consequences if project not approved	6.1 As the existing gas generators are approaching the end of their economic life there is an increasing risk of failure, resulting in difficulty maintaining internal environmental conditions. 6.2 Failure to meet safe humidification ranges will put the Corporation's artwork at risk in terms of insurance requirements for conservation of artefacts. 6.3 There is also a business reputation risk to any significant loans from national galleries on temporary exhibition in the Guildhall Art Gallery, as the Corporation is bound by loan agreements to meet correct environmental conditions and failure to meet these conditions will damage the Corporation's reputation as a borrowing institution. 6.4 It is likely that maintenance costs for the aging plant will increase.
7. SMART project objectives	7.1 By October 2022 a new humidification solution to be operational and anticipated to last at least 15 years. 7.2 The solution meets the performance specification needs for the close-environmental control areas. 7.3 The solution provides the lowest system whole-life-cost. 7.4 The solution seeks to minimise future carbon emissions. 7.5 The solution seeks to minimise local air quality impacts.
8. Key benefits	8.1 Fit for purpose facilities which preserves artefacts and meet insurance requirements. 8.2 Lower future financial burden over system asset life. 8.3 Supports the City of London Corporation's energy and carbon commitments. 8.4 Supports the City of London Corporation's Air Quality Strategy and helps improve local air quality.
9. Project category	7b. Major renewals, typically of a one-off nature (supplementary revenue)
10. Project priority	A. Essential
11. Notable exclusions	None.

Options Appraisal

12. Overview of options	12.1 GW3 shall appraise and recommend the scope for humidification provision and the main technical solutions. 12.2 GW4 shall appraise in more detailed the technical solutions for the selected scope to recommend a solution which best meets project objectives.
--------------------------------	--

Project Planning

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

13. Delivery period and key dates	<p>Overall project: approvals by: GW2 May-20, GW3 Jul-20, GW4 Oct-20, GW4a Feb-21, GW5 Apr-21, installation by Oct-21, GW6 Apr-22.</p> <p>Project completion will be Oct-21 but if there are programme delays then completion may need to be timed for Summer-22 (as summer is the ideal time for installation due to the low need for humidification at the site).</p> <p>Key dates: See Appendix 3 for additional details.</p> <p>Other works dates to coordinate: None.</p>
14. Risk implications	<p>Overall project risk: Medium</p> <p>The project costed risk post-mitigation is £188,500.</p> <p>A Costed Risk Provision of £22,000 is requested to cover the management of any asbestos found to enable the survey work and the risk of the additional surveys being required.</p> <p>After mitigation actions it is anticipated the remaining major risks will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial or complete failure of existing steam system/plant prior to installation of replacement plant/system. • Tender return costs higher than requested project budget. • Disruption to existing live services (e.g. Fire & Security) as a result of change-over. • Brexit impact - Labour shortage and / or materials shortage or delays with deliveries due to the impact of Brexit • External security threat, including terrorist activity. <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2)</p>
15. Stakeholders and consultees	<p>Chamberlains, Corporate Property, Town Clerks, departments occupying or using the Guildhall.</p>

Resource Implications

16. Total estimated cost	Likely cost range (excluding risk): £0.250m - £1.012m					
	Costs are rough estimations at present. The lower cost is based on limiting the scope of humidification to essential areas only and based on a potentially more cost-effective (non-steam) solution. It should be noted that this is lower than set out in the Project Briefing as there is an option for the project scope to be limited to essential areas only. The higher cost is based on a full like-for-like replacement of the existing steam system.					
17. Funding strategy	Likely cost range (including risk): £0.439m - £1.200m					
	Choose 1:	Choose 1:				
	Partial funding confirmed	Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource				
	<table><tr><th>Funds/Sources of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Central Funding: additional funding is requested (approved in principle)</td><td>£1.2m</td></tr></table>			Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Central Funding: additional funding is requested (approved in principle)
Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)					
Central Funding: additional funding is requested (approved in principle)	£1.2m					

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total</td><td>£1.2m</td></tr> </table> <p>This project received in principle funding of £1.2m from Resource Allocation Sub Committee meeting in December 2019 and will be split across the three funds on an appropriate basis. The release of funds is subject to approval by Resource Allocation Committee.</p>	Total	£1.2m
Total	£1.2m		
18. Investment appraisal	Whole-life-cost assessment will be undertaken. This will assess all the main capital and revenue costs over the anticipated life of the replaced assets.		
19. Procurement strategy/route to market	<p>The consultant appointments will be made in line with the City's procurement code and prior to the procurement of the Works.</p> <p>When we have further sight of the requirement for the Work, a Procurement Options Report will be provided at the next Gateway.</p>		
20. Legal implications	20.1 None.		
21. Corporate property implications	<p>21.1 Ensure no impacts to maintaining environmental conditions within close-control areas (Art Gallery).</p> <p>21.2 Consideration of desired comfort conditions within non-essential areas.</p>		
22. Traffic implications	22.1 None.		
23. Sustainability and energy implications	<p>23.1 Consideration to limit humidification to essential areas only.</p> <p>23.2 Highest efficiency plant, beyond compliance, should be considered.</p> <p>23.3 Zero emissions (non-combustion) plant should be considered to reduce air quality impacts and long-term carbon emissions.</p>		
24. IS implications	24.1 None.		
25. Equality Impact Assessment	An equality impact assessment will be undertaken.		
26. Data Protection Impact Assessment	The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken.		

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Briefing
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	Additional Project Details

Contact

Report Author	Mark Donaldson
Email Address	Mark.donaldson@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1825

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Community and Children Services Committee <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 01 April 2020 22 April 2020 24 April 2020
Subject: York Way Estate, London N7, Communal Heating Replacement Unique Project Identifier: 11535	Complex Gateway 5 Issue Report
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Lochlan MacDonald	For Decision
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: To renew the current communal heating system serving three blocks at York Way Estate.</p> <p>RAG Status: Amber (Amber at last report to Committee, Gateway 5)</p> <p>Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee, gateway 5)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £3,150,490</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): Increase of £62,500 (2%) since last report to Committee</p> <p>Spend to Date: £23,550 (no change from Gateway 5).</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0 (No CRP was requested at Gateway 5);</p> <p>Slippage: There are eight flats at Kinefold House, previously converted from an infill space, which are not on the current communal system. It was intended that these would continue to use their own individual gas boilers for heating their homes. However, Cadent, who manages the gas supply networks, has</p>
-------------------------	--

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

	<p>since confirmed that the gas supply to these flats is now to be discontinued. Therefore, provision will have to be made to heat these flats and, this can be best achieved by including them in the new communal heating system installation. We have been advised by Cadent that the gas supply to the eight individual flats will be turned off in April 2020. As the new communal heating system will not be available until late 2020 at the earliest, further budgetary provision is needed for a temporary solution to heat the eight flats until they can be fully connected to the new system. To ensure that residents are not left without heating at any point, the temporary heating works will be funded from previously approved funding for this project, which will then be repaid from the requested additional funding. The additional works are not expected to delay the project completion date.</p>										
2. Requested decisions	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 6, Outcome report</p> <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the contents of this report are noted; 2. That an additional budget of £40,000 is approved from the Housing Revenue Account for connecting eight flats to the new communal heating system at the York Way Estate. 3. That a further budget of £22,500 is approved from the Housing Revenue Account for temporary heating to be provided at the eight flats due to the existing gas supply being disconnected 4. That approval is given for TSG to undertake the works outlined at 2 and 3 above; 5. Note the revised project budget of £3,150,490 (excluding risk); 6. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £3,150,490 (excluding risk). 7. That Option 1, to supply temporary electric boilers and then connect the new communal heating system to the eight previously converted flats at Kinefold House, is approved 										
3. Budget	<p>Revised total cost</p> <p>This is an increase of £62,500 (2%) due to necessary, unforeseen works.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th><th>Reason</th><th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Temporary heating to flats</td><td>To supply temporary heating via</td><td>Housing Revenue Account</td><td>£22,500</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Temporary heating to flats	To supply temporary heating via	Housing Revenue Account	£22,500
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)								
Temporary heating to flats	To supply temporary heating via	Housing Revenue Account	£22,500								

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

		electric boilers in 8 no. flats		
	Extend new communal heating system	To connect 8 no. flats to communal heating system	Housing Revenue Account	£40,000
	Total			£62,500
Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £0 (No costed risk provision requested).				
4. Issue description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current communal system is being replaced as it has reached the end of its life expectancy. 2. 8 converted flats at Kinefold House, which were previously built as an infill project, have their own individual gas boilers that supply the heating to their homes (hot water is provided separately). The new flats were not connected to the existing communal system at the time. Whilst the exact reasons for this decision cannot be confirmed, it is possible that the costs of providing the eight properties with individual heating was more cost effective than connecting them to the communal system. 3. Cadent, who is responsible for the gas supply to individual properties, has advised that the gas supply to three York Way blocks, which supplies individual flats, is to be disconnected. 4. The gas supply for the communal heating and hot water system is not affected by Cadent's plans. 5. Cadent has advised that the reason why they are disconnecting individual flats' gas supplies is that the gas supply pipe network is embedded within the fabric of the building and is difficult to service, maintain and repair. 6. Whilst Cadent considered a new, externally run gas supply network, this was decided against due to costs, aesthetics and the fact that most flats were on the communal system for heating and hot water. 7. Cadent have made payments of £2,000 per dwelling to those affected by the gas disconnection, in lieu of buying electric cookers to replace existing gas ones. The tenants in the eight dwellings at Kinefold House mentioned above have received this payment. 8. The City has a duty to ensure that heating is provided to the dwellings affected by the gas disconnection. This can be achieved by connecting the flats to the 			

	<p>replacement communal heating, and TSG has quoted a cost of £40,000 to include these flats.</p> <p>9. However, as the gas supply disconnection will occur in April 2020, and the new communal heating system will not go live until late 2020 at the earliest, the City must provide temporary heating in the interim period.</p> <p>10. Cadent was asked to contribute to the cost of temporary heating and connecting the flats to the new system when this is installed. However, Cadent refused as, they are already paying £2,000 per dwelling to residents, and believe that it is the City's responsibility to ensure heating provision within their own housing stock given the way the buildings were built (with gas supply pipes generally inaccessible as they were built into the fabric of the building). As Cadent is ultimately responsible for the timing of the disconnection, and the urgent need to ensure no residents are left without heating, there is no time to pursue this matter further with Cadent.</p> <p>11. The options for the temporary heating for the 8 flats are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide each flat with electric boilers connected to the existing radiators and controls within all 8 flats at a cost of £22,500 • Provide standalone electric heaters (3 per property) at a total cost of £2,400 <p>12. The costs of running electric heaters will be compensated for by the fact that residents will no longer have to pay for gas and also the £2,000 payment from Cadent.</p>
<p>5. Options</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Option One – Connect 8 no. flats to the new communal system, and provide interim temporary heating in the meantime by installing electric boilers in all 8 flats, at a cost of £62,500 Option Two – Connect 8 no. flats to the new communal system, and provide interim temporary heating in the meantime by providing plug in electric heaters (3 per flat) to residents of all 8 flats, at an estimated cost of £42,400. Option Three – Install permanent individual electric boilers within 8 no. flats, to replace redundant gas boilers at a cost of £22,500. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option one will discharge the City's duty in providing temporary and permanent heating. The provision of electric boilers as a short-term measure is more expensive and intrusive in terms of installation works compared to stand alone heaters. However, the heating provided will ensure total heating within each property, the boilers can be connected to existing pipework and

	<p>radiators and will be fully compliant. Once the flats are connected to the new communal system, the electric boilers will be removed, and the possibility of storing these for future re-use will be considered. This makes sense in the longer term due to lower running costs for residents, for consistency and for future maintenance. Furthermore, the option reflects the thinking that communal systems are regarded as a better solution in environmental terms. The new system will be less likely to fail completely or need extensive repairs. However, in the event that the system goes wrong, this will be covered by defects liability and then the existing maintenance contract. For these reasons, this option is RECOMMENDED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option Two will discharge the City's duty in providing temporary and permanent heating. This is less expensive than providing temporary electric boilers. The heating provided by these heaters will be for specific rooms rather than throughout the whole flat. As they will not be able to heat the entire flat, and given the amount of time they could be used until the full system is connected, they will have to be on for longer so running costs of these heaters is expected to be higher. The heaters are not as efficient as a dedicated system and the running costs are generally higher. The heaters will be freestanding and portable to a degree, but this will mean their power cables from sockets will form potential trip hazards. These heaters also represent an increased fire risk, especially if residents cover them or dry clothes on them. Once the flats are connected to the new communal system, the electric heaters will be reclaimed by the City and require storage. As per option one, connecting the flats to the new communal system makes sense in the longer term due to lower running costs for residents and for consistency and future maintenance, and reflects the thinking that communal systems are regarded as a better solution in environmental terms. However, due to the issues outlined above with regard to free standing electric heaters, this option is NOT RECOMMENDED.• Option Three will discharge the City's duty in providing immediate and permanent heating. However, this would mean that the running costs for these flats will be higher than for other properties served by the communal system, and will require separate maintenance arrangements. For these reasons, this option is NOT RECOMMENDED.
--	--

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	

Contact

Report Author	Lochlan MacDonald
Email Address	Lochlan.macdonald@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3939

Committees: Corporate Projects Board - <i>for information</i> Projects Sub - <i>for decision</i> Streets and Walkways Committee - <i>for decision</i>	Dates: 1/4/2020 22/4/2020 28/4/2020
Subject: 20 Farringdon/ Old Fleet Lane Unique Project Identifier: 11980	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Light
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Daniel Laybourn, City Transportation	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: <u>20 Farringdon / Old Fleet Lane</u> The highway improvements implemented under the section 278 works, alongside those undertaken by Transport for London (TfL) on their adjacent road network, can be summarised as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurfacing of the carriageway and footways in Old Fleet Lane; • Construction of a new footway crossover to the development's new service entrance; • New highways drainage, including adjusted surface levels, and road lining; and • Works to Statutory Undertakers' apparatus and other structures as result of the changes above. RAG Status: Green (Green at the last report to Committee) Risk Status: Low (Low at the last report to Committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: (not applicable) Final Outturn Costs: £173,743
-------------------------	--

2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: Members of Streets and Walkways and Project Sub-Committees are asked to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve the content of this outcome report; • Authorise the Chamberlain's department to return unspent section 278 funds to the Developer as set out in the respective legal agreement subject to the verification of the final account; and • Agree to close the 20 Farringdon/ Old Fleet Lane project.
3. Key conclusions	<p>The improvements have been successfully implemented following the completion of the building as agreed with the Developer. There was a year delay to construction due to a British Telecom (BT) fibre optic connection needing to be relocated. The Developer was required under the S278 agreement to pay the excess to cover the associated extra costs which were not originally included in either the G1/2 and G5 gateway reports.</p> <p>Work was therefore completed a year later than planned in October 2019. Other than the additional costs to the Developer, there were no other impacts arising from this issue. Safe and full pedestrian and vehicular access to the development and adjacent highways was still available during the period of the delay.</p>

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	The proposed design has successfully accommodated the associated new private development. The City's Highways Team and the term contractor (J B Riney) worked together with the developer to re-programme works where necessary.
5. Options appraisal	The project was limited in its opportunities to explore different designs due to both the standardised nature of the work and the tangible restrictions around them, such as building lines and the road network. Therefore, alternative options were not explored.
6. Procurement route	The design was prepared in-house by the City's highways team and the City's term contractor was used to deliver the project.
7. Skills base	The Project Team had the skills, knowledge and experience to manage and deliver the project.

v.April 2019

8. Stakeholders	Stakeholders were engaged throughout the processes and despite delays, the project was able to deliver the highways changes to the Stakeholder's satisfaction.
------------------------	--

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	As mentioned above, the City's construction period was delayed by a year to relocate a BT fibre-optic connection. However, this didn't affect the occupation of the new development going to plan and had no impacts on any other stakeholders.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	No change in design to that approved at Gateway 5.
11. Risks and issues	The only significant issue was the delay caused by the relocation of the BT fibre optic connection. As this is infrastructure owned by a third party, there was little the project team could do to expedite this to enable the City's design programme work to occur sooner. However, undertaking the C3 utility surveys earlier would have meant that the issue was identified and accounted for sooner which could have minimised the delay in starting our work.
12. Transition to BAU	The project is now complete and has been passed over to the Highways Maintenance team to manage. The scheme was designed and built to the City's specifications.

Value Review

13. Budget

<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost – ‘Under £250k’	
------------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

	<i>Revised Budget after G5</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost (as of 21/2/2020)</i>
<i>Fees</i>	£12,430	£7,012
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£31,206	£22,482
<i>Works (including contingency)</i>	£78,846	£73,984
<i>Utilities</i>	£77,091**	£68,940
<i>Maintenance*</i>	£1,326	£1,326
<i>Total</i>	£200,899	£173,743

* Commuted maintenance sum to be charged for at the point of final account verification.

	<p><i>**The additional £52,291.45 on top of the approved G5 budget of £30,000 relates to the costs associated with the BT fibre-optic cable relocation that were fully met by the Developer.</i></p> <p>For more detail, please see Appendix 2.</p> <p>Please confirm whether the Final Account for this project has been verified – They have not been verified as of 10/3/2020.</p>
14. Investment	Not applicable.
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p>The project achieved its objectives of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering a high-quality public realm in the vicinity of the development (via the upgrade to Yorkstone footway paving); and • Delivering a scheme that benefits all users of the public highway.
16. Key benefits realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has implemented measures that both improve the environment for people walking and that enhance the public realm; and • It has also delivered highway changes which accommodate new developments and meet the needs of developers.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<p>The project team worked very well with the Developer and TfL staff, who were the main stakeholders throughout the project. In the run up to the construction phase, the team alleviated the concerns of neighbouring businesses by accommodating their business activities within the construction planning, which included a significant office relocation.</p>
18. Improvement reflections	<p>The G5 project estimate and therefore the S278 agreement included a provisional sum for the estimated amount of utility work required for this highways scheme. This amount was informed by previous projects of similar scale and allowed the project team to proceed to signing the S278 agreement with the Developer. The Developer pushed for the S278 agreement to be made on this basis, rather than wait for the utility owners to submit estimates to inform the overall project estimate. This decision would have been made to ensure that the planned occupation of the new building was not at risk of being delayed by any delay to the signing of the S278 agreement.</p> <p>In reflection, given the increasing prevalence of more modern utility infrastructure such as these fibre optics connections,</p>

	these early provisional estimates may need to increase on future schemes to better prepare the Developer of the likely costs, and if the utility cost is not realised then it will be returned to the Developer. Also, C3 utility surveys should be undertaken sooner to mitigate against low estimates and increased delays should other Developers request the same approach in future.
19. Sharing best practice	Dissemination of information through team and project staff briefings has taken place
20. AOB	The project predates the requirement for project coversheets. Therefore, none are included in the appendices of this report.

Appendices

Appendix 1	20 Farringdon Street/ Old Fleet Lane before and after photos
Appendix 2	20 Farringdon/ Old Fleet Lane Final Project Costs

Contact

Report Author	Daniel Laybourn
Email Address	Daniel.laybourn@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 3041

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee City of London Police Authority Board	Date: Urgency
Subject: Decisions arising from informal April 2020 meeting – Gateway 1/2/3/4 Secure City and Gateway 6 IT Infrastructure Refresh	Public
Report of: Town Clerk	Information
Report author: Alistair MacLellan, Town Clerk's Department	

Public Summary

MAIN REPORTS NOT FOR PUBLICATION

These reports are exempt by virtue of the paragraphs 3 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972. Specifically, the report contains sensitive information which may be exempted under the Act, and as this cannot be presented to Members as a separate appendix this report needs to be considered in closed session. It is considered that information falling under the following paragraphs outweighs the public interest in disclosing information:

3)	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person or body (including the authority holding that information).
7)	Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

Background

Due to COVID-19 it was not possible to hold a quorate meeting of the Police Authority Board on 2 April 2020. Instead, an informal meeting was convened via Microsoft Teams with Members being given the opportunity to comment on reports that would have been for decision, on the understanding that the Town Clerk would take their comments into account when approving the reports under urgency procedure. There were two reports for decision:

Gateway 1/2/3/4 – Secure City

Secure City is a joint programme between City of London Corporation and City of London Police which seeks to complete the City's Ring of Steel security measures. The report set out the headline details of the nine proposed projects in the Secure City Programme and summarises the total cost of the programme over the next three years. Members noted comments made at the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee.

Gateway 6 – Technology Infrastructure Refresh

Members were content with a Gateway 6 report of the Commissioner regarding a Technology Infrastructure Refresh.

Action Taken

The Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairmen and Deputy Chair,

Gateway 1/2/3/4 – Secure City

- Noted the overall programme cost;
- Approved the proposed projects within the wider programme;
- Noted the resource profile for the overall programme;
- Noted that Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee had approved first year capital funding.

Gateway 6 – Technology Infrastructure Refresh

- Noted the lessons learned and approved the closure of the project.

Alistair MacLellan

Town Clerk's Department

Alistair.maclellan@cityoflondon.gov.uk